REMARKS

Claims 10-18 are pending in the application. The drawings are objected to. Claims 10-18 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by US patent 6,298,319 (Heile et al.).

Claims 10, 11, 13, 15, 17, and 18 are amended herein. Claim 14 is canceled. Claims 19-22 are new. No new matter has been added. Claims 10-13 and 15-22 are presented for examination.

References to Applicant's paragraph and line numbers herein are relative to the substitute specification.

Drawing objections

The drawings are amended in response to the objections. A new FIG 3 is provided to illustrate aspects of the claimed method as taught in the specification. A new paragraph is added to the specification to describe this drawing. No new matter is added.

Description of the claim amendments

The claim preambles are changed from "designing or configuring a project representing an automation system" to "designing or configuring a process control system . . .". This is not a change in subject matter or classification, since the recited elements of the claims remain the basically same, subject to further clarifying amendments. The preambles now better describe the context of the elements, as supported in the specification (par. 14 and 15, FIG 2). If Examiner prefers it, the preambles will be amended to recite "designing or configuring a project for designing or configuring a process control system . . .". This is acceptable, but seems unnecessary.

The following element of the amendment is found in paragraph 16, lines 15-21:

"wherein the project design blocks comprise software objects representing operating and observation systems, input and output modules, the actuators, the sensors, bus systems, and software blocks for creating control programs for the programmable controllers."

A new independent claim 19 replaces previous claim 13, and is supported throughout the specification. Subject matter of new claim 20 is supported in par. 16, lines 5-12. Subject matter of new claim 21 is supported in paragraph 18. Subject matter of new claim 22 is supported on page 6, lines 1-5.

Response to rejections under 35 USC 112

Claim 11 is amended to recite "a request by a user", thus introducing both "a request" and "a user". Claim 13 depends from claim 11.

Response to rejections under 35 USC 102(b)

Heile teaches a workgroup system for designing programmable logic devices (PLDs), which are integrated circuits that can be programmed for a desired function. The present invention manages the designing or configuring of a process control system of actuators, sensors, programmable controllers, input and output devices, and operating and observation stations, interconnected by a communications network for controlling a plant. Although hardware in the present process control system includes programmable controllers 6, which may include PLDs, they are only a subset of the claimed process control system. This is clarified by amendments herein. Therefore Heile does not teach the remaining process control design features of the present invention as claimed.

In the Office Communication in the first three paragraphs at top of page 6, Examiner cites Heile col. 11, lines 13-30 and col. 8, line 62, et seq. However, these lines of Heile teach copying of files from locally modified files to a global work space. In contrast, Applicant claims copying of files from a central library to programming devices for local modification. Applicant's par. 16, last 3 lines: "In a memory (not shown here) of the management unit 12 there are stored centrally, in a library, project design blocks Pb1 , Pb2 , Pb3 , . . . Pbn, which are provided for the design an d/or configuration of the part projects Tp1 , . . . , Tp4 on the programming devices 13 , 14 , 15 , 16 ." This is the reverse direction of copying compared to the cited lines of Heile.

In the Office Communication regarding claim 13, Examiner cites lines of Heile that teach coordinating the replacement of a file in a central library with a locally modified file. However, this is not what is claimed herein, but is instead in the reverse direction. Claims 13, 17, and 22 herein recite the controlled updating of a design block on all of the programming devices from a central library when any programming device request an update of that design block. In that case, a prompt is displayed on each programming device, and the update is only performed if each programming device returns a user acceptance in response to the prompt. After receiving such acceptance, all of the programming devices are updated. This is not found in Heile.

Conclusion

For anticipation under 35 USC 102, a reference must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present (MPEP 706.02(a) IV). The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as recited in the claim, and the elements must be arranged as required by the claim (MPEP §2131). These criteria are not met for the independent claims by Heile, as argued above. The dependent claims should be allowable as including the limitations of an allowable base claim in addition to other limitations. Therefore Applicants feel this application is in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

The commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any appropriate fees due in connection with this paper, including fees for additional claims and terminal disclaimer fee, or credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 19-2179.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 7/21/08

By: _____

John P. Musone
Registration No. 44,961
(407) 736-6449

Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
170 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, New Jersey 08830